

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION**

**EMI APRIL MUSIC, INC.,  
HUNGLIKEYOURA (MUSIC), HIDEOUT  
RECORDS DISTRIBUTORS, INC. (GEAR  
PUBLISHING DIVISION), INNOCENT  
BYSTANDER, UNIVERSAL-POLYGRAM  
INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHING, INC.,  
and WRITE TREAT AGE MUSIC,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**K&K CORPORATION, an Oregon  
corporation, and WANDA HEMENWAY,**

Defendants.

Case No. 3:12-cv-01143-PK

**OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING  
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**SIMON, District Judge.**

Magistrate Judge Paul Papak filed Findings and Recommendations in this case on December 14, 2012. Dkt. 27. Judge Papak recommended that the Court grant in part and deny in part Plaintiffs' motion for an award of attorney fees and bill of costs, Dkts. 22 and 25, and Plaintiffs should be awarded a total of \$7,948.25. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act, the court may "accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendations, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If, however, no objections are filed, the Magistrates Act does not prescribe any standard of review. In such cases, “[t]here is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Magistrates Act] intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report[.]” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (court must review *de novo* magistrate’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”).

Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the court review the magistrate’s findings and recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

No objections having been made, the court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Magistrate Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendations for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Papak’s Findings and Recommendations, Dkt. 27.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 10th day of January, 2013.

/s/ Michael H. Simon  
Michael H. Simon  
United States District Judge